



**S.L.I.D.
RESEARCH
TRACTS**

No. 1

SUBSIDIZATION OF THE ARTS-

**A Survey of Governmental Aid to Music,
Art and Theatre in the Free World.**

EMMETT GROSECLO

Student League for Industrial Democracy

- 35 Cents -

136 (26)
EMMETT GROSECLOSE

SUBSIDIZATION OF THE ARTS

A Survey of Governmental Aid
to
Music, Art and the Theatre
in the Free World

THE STUDENT LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

New York, New York

Copyright 1956

The Student League for Industrial Democracy

All Rights Reserved

However, permission to reprint portions of this Tract, without charge, may be obtained by writing to the Student League for Industrial Democracy, 112 East 19th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

Subsidization of the Arts, like all S. L. I. D. Research Tracts, is published by the Student League for Industrial Democracy as part of its program of education for increasing democracy in our economic, social and political life. The author alone is responsible for the material in this Tract which does not necessarily represent the opinions of the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

About the Author

Emmett Groseclose, a member of the S. L. I. D. National Executive Committee, has studied the question of art subsidies for many years. He first became interested in the subject while engaged in theatrical work; and he has given several lectures and broadcasts on this question. At present, Mr. Groseclose is continuing his studies in sociology at Columbia University.

Subsidization of the Arts is the first in the series of S. L. I. D. Research Tracts. The Tracts were originated by the Student League for Industrial Democracy to help celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of its parent organization, the League for Industrial Democracy.

This series is dedicated to that noble faith in democracy which has inspired the LID during its half century of pioneering efforts and in particular to Dr. Harry W. Laidler, Executive Director of the LID, who has for many years embodied the spirit of the League. It is Dr. Laidler, more than any other man, who is responsible for the League's impact on American social thought and to him that the Editors dedicate this series.

INTRODUCTION

C 518
37

The reader should be warned beforehand that he will not find in this pamphlet a polemic, either for or against public support of the arts. This research tract was published to make available some of the "raw material" which is necessary for informed discussion of this important question, and not to make converts to a cause. This is not to say that the author or the publishers do not necessarily have their own opinions; but it was felt that certain questions should be answered from the very start. We have tried to give information on what countries subsidize the arts, what arts are affected, how much is spent, how the sums are channeled, etc. We have also tried to give a brief picture of the background of such proposals in the United States. In the pages covering the debate on the most recent art subsidy bill proposed to Congress, the reader will find some of the more common arguments pro and con.

Since this is the first attempt at this subject since before the war, the author has had to write directly to the governments concerned for any information. The answers received account for the differing thoroughness of each report, and some governments, unfortunately, have not published enough material to give an accurate picture of their programs. To compensate for this, we have given an exhaustive description of the British situation, since this is the nation whose program is most often suggested as a model for the U. S.

We have, on the whole, tried to limit ourselves to national programs and have included only governments which support and do not control the arts in their countries. With the possible exception of the Union of South Africa, it may be said that the countries represent the bulk of the "free world".

The question of government pressure on the arts is, of course, extremely difficult to document. The general feeling would seem to be that expressed in the report on Norway; that the government would not dream of perverting the institutions which it is trying to aid. In the way of negative evidence, it may be of interest to note that not one of the many reports on art subsidy in free countries suggests that there is any sign of government interference.

It is often felt, however, that foreign examples will not do for
State University of Iowa
LIBRARIES

the United States with its unique history in matters of public control. The question of "strings" is one that cannot be debated here but it must be remembered that there are all sorts of strings on federal aid: strings which forbid aid to segregated institutions as well as strings that set political standards for cultural activities.

Doubts about an art subsidy program seem to center in two areas. One expressed in the Committee hearings are on finance - can we afford such a program. In showing what other countries are doing, this Tract may help answer that question. The other concern, which has not been voiced as often in the hearings, is that of governmental control accompanying any aid. An answer to this question would have to be conjectural. Pointing to government aid to schools, libraries and other cultural institutions may be of some use. There have been attempts to control the choice of books or art work on the local as well as the Federal level. The success of these efforts has depended on the interest and efforts of the citizenry. Ultimately, the success of any democratic endeavor will depend on an informed citizenry - and it is in the hope that this pamphlet may help to encourage intelligent discussion of the question of art subsidies that we offer this Research Tract.

THE EDITORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Editor's Introduction	5
Preface	8
Where Government Gives the Greatest Aid:	
Great Britain	9
France	14
Italy	15
Austria	15
Finland and Sweden	19
Norway	20
Programs of Lesser Aid:	
Turkey	24
India	24
Brazil	24
New Zealand	25
Union of South Africa	25
Israel	26
The Subsidy Picture at Home: Canada and the United States	27
Conclusion	33
Appendix: Specific Governmental Appropriations: . .	34
Austria	35
Finland	37
Great Britain	38
Ireland	40
Italy	41
The Netherlands	41
New Zealand	42
Norway	42
Bibliography	44
Suggested Reading	46

PREFACE

There is today in the United States widespread interest in the idea that government should give financial aid to artists, playwrights, poets, actors, dancers, and singers and to art institutions. This interest is evident from the fact that the late 83rd Congress had under consideration sixteen bills that sought to subsidize the arts.¹ Although none of the bills were enacted into law hundreds of organizations and individuals participated in the hearings held on thirteen of the bills in Washington, D. C. on June 8 and June 9, 1954.² Undoubtedly future Congresses will continue to give attention to the numerous arts-subsidy proposals which have been made during the past decade or so (ever since the termination of the Federal Arts Projects under the Works Progress Administration).

In view of the present efforts to bring about in the United States a system for subsidization of the arts, the present programs for subvention or subsidization in operation in other countries should be of special interest. Unfortunately, there is no single published report or book that contains descriptions of such programs for all those nations which have them. The most recent survey conducted in this area -- in fact, the only one as far as is known -- is the book entitled Government and the Arts by Grace Overmyer (1939). Miss Overmyer has presented an extensive analysis of the subsidy programs which were in operation about two decades ago in fifty-eight countries (those with a population of more than a million). Especially to be noted in her book are the tables giving a country-by-country picture of art subsidization as it existed before the war.

The information presented in this brochure on the foreign subsidy programs was obtained primarily from foreign consulates, embassies, and information services in the United States. Contact with thirty-two agencies elicited limited information in most cases, nearly all of it appearing here. Some of the agencies, in fact, were unprepared to supply any specific information. Only one agency (the British Information Services) had publications dealing specifically with governmental subsidization of the arts.

1 From an address by Representative Charles R. Howell, Democrat, New Jersey, before the Woman's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., May 24, 1954.

2 Federal Grants for Fine Arts Programs and Projects (see Bibliography).

II. WHERE GOVERNMENT GIVES THE GREATEST AID

Since the beginning of civilization cultural pursuits have rarely been able to compete in the marketplace with commodities or with services catering to the elemental needs of a society. Thus, in ancient times musicians, writers, teachers, and priests sought protection and support from tribal chiefs, kings, and emperors. Down through the centuries various forms of social nurturing of the arts and of artists has found acceptance in diverse cultures in all parts of the world. Consequently, advocates of governmental aid to the arts and to artists in the United States have a claim that is based upon several thousand years of tradition.

In contemporary times the most extensive and highly developed systems of art subvention are found in the European countries and in the United Kingdom. Although the systems in countries like Austria, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Sweden are varied, the governments responsible for them are all committed to the principle that the arts are the highest expression of a national culture and that any nation desiring to make a maximum imprint upon world history must aid or support those who produce and interpret works of art.

GREAT BRITAIN

The present system of governmental subsidization of the arts in Great Britain began during the war with the establishment of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, presently known as the Arts Council. The government's objective at that time was to provide inexpensive entertainment and other cultural outlets for the population suffering from the hardships caused by the war. "It made grants to agents and business firms that were able to arrange tours for individuals and groups, and sometimes gave money directly to artists who could manage their own tours. This was done on a non-profit basis, and any money made after expenses had to be used for approved projects."³

The Arts Council, which was granted a Royal Charter on August 9, 1946, "while sponsored by the Government, is not a

3 Entertainment and the Arts in Great Britain, p. 5.

Government department. Its chairman and governors (called members of the Council) are appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer after consultation with the Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland. The Chancellor answers for the Council in the House of Commons.⁴ The fourteen members serve for five years without pay except for expenses. There is a paid executive committee chosen by the Council and the Treasury consisting of the chairman, vice-chairman, and the chairmen of the advisory panels which represent each of the arts (drama, music, etc.). There are, in addition, a committee for Scotland and one for Wales. Each of the three departments of the Council (drama, music, and art) employs a full-time director appointed on a five-year contract. There are also eleven regional directors.

The following quotation shows the relationship between the Arts Council and the British Treasury:

"Treasury control is maintained through a Treasury Assessor to the Arts Council; on his advice, the Chancellor of the Exchequer recommends to Parliament a sum to be granted. The Assessor attends meetings of the Council as well as most meetings of the Executive Committee. He is therefore in a position to judge whether the grant is being properly distributed, but he does not interfere with the autonomy of the Council.

"The Council, in its turn, supports the arts of the country by giving financial assistance or guarantees to organizations, companies, and societies; by directly providing concerts and exhibitions; and sometimes by directly managing a company or theatre. The recipient organizations, for their part, must be non-profit groups or charitable trusts capable of helping to carry out the Council's purpose of bringing the British people entertainment of a high standard. Such organizations must have been accepted as non-profit companies for charitable trusts by H. M. Commissioners of Customs and Excise, and exempted by them from liability to pay Entertainments Duty."⁵

Throughout Great Britain there are numerous arts clubs in the smaller communities which work closely with the Arts Council to expedite its work at the local level by assisting with promotional

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6

work, guaranteeing minimum audiences, etc. In the towns whose size prohibits building separate theaters, galleries, concert halls, etc., what is known as the art center has been developed. It is a single building, usually one that has been specially converted to the purpose, that provides facilities for all of the artistic and entertainment activities that the arts club brings to the community. The Arts Council in 1946, for instance, in the town of Bridgwater (population 22,000) "took an 18th-century house, using the hall for plays, concerts, movies, exhibitions, and dances, and smaller rooms for committee meetings, classes, lectures, a snack bar, and offices. The hall and rooms are hired, mainly by the active Bridgwater Arts Club, which may ultimately take over the Arts Center. Touring theatre companies, professional musical performers, and the Arts Council's own art exhibitions regularly use the hall (as do local amateur societies for rehearsals of one kind or another), and conferences of both national and international character."⁶

Among the better-known organizations associated with the Arts Council in one way or another are the London Philharmonic Orchestra, London Symphony Orchestra, Covent Garden Opera Company, Sadler's Wells Ballet, Sadler's Wells Theatre Ballet, Old Vic (London), and Young Vic.

The Covent Garden Opera Trust, which uses the Royal Opera House at Covent Garden, is a non-profit body whose profits, if any, are used to further the activities of the organization. The two chief companies under the Trust are the Sadler's Wells Ballet and the Covent Garden Opera Company. "The aim of the Trust at Covent Garden is to create a steady audience, and to appeal to groups that have not hitherto attended opera and ballet, or have attended only when the most brilliant stars were performing. Seats sell for as little as 2s. 6d. (35¢), rising to 26s. 3d. (\$3.67), and the opera- and ballet-going habit has grown noticeably in recent years. In 1948-49 the audience for opera averaged 83 per cent capacity, and for the ballet 92 per cent."⁷

The British Government also assists schools of art, music, and drama. Grants are made to such institutions as the Royal Academy of Music, Royal College of Music, Royal Manchester College of Music, Royal Scottish Academy of Music, Royal

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14

Academy of Dramatic Art, and the Royal College of Art. "Public funds also help to support over 200 local art schools and classes administered by Local Education Authorities."⁸

The British Film Institute is an organization in the field of motion pictures similar to the Arts Council in the fields of legitimate theater, concert, opera, ballet, painting, sculpture, and related arts. Through the Film Institute the government aids film societies in their efforts to promote motion picture appreciation. The government engages in film production and distribution through the Film Division of the Central Office of Information (successor to the wartime Ministry of Information), the Central Film Library, and the Mobile Film Units -- the last of which exhibits movies in schools, factories, village halls, clubs, etc. Government film production is primarily in the field of documentaries. In April 1949 the government set up the National Film Finance Corporation to make loans to commercial producing and distributing companies. Aid in this manner was given to the motion pictures *The Last Days of Dolwyn* and *The Third Man*. "The Corporation is empowered to borrow up to 5,000,000 pounds (\$14,000,000) from the Board of Trade. In the first months of 1950 the Corporation was financially concerned with at least half the films being made in British studios."⁹

In 1944 the government began making regular grants in the field of industrial design through the Council of Industrial Design. The Council's predecessor was the Council for Art in Industry. Parliament had enabled the government to give financial assistance in this field when it established the School of Design (now the Royal College of Art) in 1836 with a subsidy of \$4,200. The Council's first grant was \$11,200 (1944); in 1950-51 it received \$750,400. It operates an advisory service for private enterprise, nationalized industries, and government departments. Motion pictures, booklets, radio broadcasts, and exhibitions are the means by which it engenders in the public an appreciation for well-designed products.¹⁰

The British Broadcasting Corporation, which was set up by Royal Charter on January 1, 1927 to operate all radio in Britain, "is controlled by a Board of Governors nominated by the Govern-

⁸ Ibid., pp. 16-17

⁹ Ibid., pp. 17-20

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 20-21

ment, and managed by a Director-General appointed by the Governors. The employees are not civil servants; Parliament has the right of ultimate control, however, and since the B.B.C. operates under license from the Postmaster-General, the latter is answerable to Parliament on policy matters. In peacetime, the B.B.C. has complete independence in the day-to-day management of business. In wartime, the Government has power to take over and operate the service, a power that has never been formally used."¹¹

The owner of a radio or television set must pay an annual fee: one pound (\$2.80) for radio and two pounds (\$5.60) for radio and television together. From this source and from revenue from publications the Home and Television Services derives its financing. "In the year ended March 31, 1949, the net income from licenses was 9,444,472 pounds (\$26,444,522), and from publications 989,544 pounds (\$2,770,723). The Overseas Services are financed by a grant-in-aid from the Broadcasting Vote of Parliament: 4,685,000 pounds (\$13,118,000) in the year ending March 31, 1951. The total Parliamentary grant for broadcasting in that year was 17,285,000 pounds (\$48,398,000)."¹²

B.B.C. is not permitted to editorialize politically in its news programs. However, despite its non-partisanship it does make time available for the purpose of presenting controversial subjects like politics, industry, and religion. During election campaigns it must extend its facilities to the nominees of the main political parties.

Established in 1934, the British Council exists to strengthen cultural relations between Great Britain and foreign countries. Although it is not a government organization it receives grants from the government. One of its activities is arranging for the exchange of students and teachers with foreign countries. Another is the support of British libraries and information services abroad. The British Council also finances the tours of British lecturers and exhibitions, and of theatrical, musical, and ballet troupes abroad. Sadler's Wells Ballet, the Old Vic Company, and John Gielgud's theater company have made tours abroad in recent years under the auspices of the British Council.

Not only from the national government do the arts receive encouragement and support but also from the municipalities. By

¹¹ Ibid., p. 21

¹² Ibid., p. 21

means of the Local Government Act of 1948 "Provision of Entertainments Clause" cities and towns are authorized to provide facilities for dances, concerts, plays, and other types of entertainment.

As is indicated above, except perhaps for radio, the fields of art and entertainment cannot be described as being nationalized, whatever the advantages or disadvantages of nationalization may be. The institutions in these fields retain their pre-subsidy organizational structures and modes of operation although they receive financial assistance from the government through the various non-government bodies responsible for encouraging the arts. Several of the municipalities, of course, directly own symphony orchestras, theaters, art galleries, museums, etc. But the major theatrical and artistic organizations, unlike many of the corresponding institutions on the European continent, are organically separate from the government.

FRANCE

The French national and municipal governments many years ago assumed the burden of financing the arts. Several theaters, for example, are nationally or municipally owned and are supported by grants from the state or municipality.¹³ Since such theater organizations are not required to operate profitably, they are able to employ large staffs of performers, directors, electricians, administrators, etc. and to use the repertory system of production requiring large casts and expensive scenery. The four national theater companies located in Paris are the Opéra, the Opéra-Comique, the Comédie-Française, and the Théâtre National Populaire. The first two have been since 1939 under the authority of a single administrator who is elected for three years by the President of the Council of Ministers (Prime Minister) on the recommendation of the Minister of Fine Arts. "This representative of the state is free to hire the 1,200 actors and technicians of the Opéra and the Opéra-Comique, who are bound to him, for 1 year, under the stipulations of common law. Those who have no individual contract benefit by collective agreements which have been drawn with the approval of the representatives of the personnel."¹⁴

¹³ Laurent, Jeanne, "The Theater in France," Federal Grants for Fine Arts Programs and Projects. (hearings), pp. 258-261.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 258

Not only do the state theaters receive governmental support but private companies can also receive assistance. The national government, for instance, finances tours of private companies abroad. The companies of Louis Jouvet, Madeline Renaud, and Jean-Louis Barrault received aid in this manner when they visited the United States in recent years.

ITALY

All of the arts have received subsidies from the Italian government for several decades. Outstanding among them is the Italian opera, which today is subsidized more heavily than in any other European country and more than in any previous period.¹⁵ "Singers receive high wages, more theaters are in operation, and the overall standard of performances is higher than it was fifteen years ago."

Opera receives its subsidies from a special tax which the government has since 1946 levied on all entertainments (including football games, movies, circuses, concerts, and plays). The tax is eighteen per cent of all admissions. "Two-thirds of it is used for the upkeep of the large, corporate houses or enti autonomi in Rome, Milan, Venice, Bologna, Genoa, Florence, Naples, Cagliari, and Palermo. Turin also belongs to this group, although today it still has no proper house because of wartime destruction."

"The other third is divided among the dozens of small towns and independent companies. This part of the subsidy supports not only opera but concerts and drama. A committee adjudicates each case, and fixes the amount to be given, according to the relative importance of the opera house and the city in which it is situated, the history of the house, its suggested program, and the duration of its season."

AUSTRIA

Austrian writers, musicians, actors, painters, dancers, singers, and other artists as well as artistic institutions receive financial assistance from the federal, state, and municipal govern-

¹⁵ Jenkins, Newell, "Opera in Italy," Musical America, quotations from p. 8.

ments.¹⁶ The subsidized theaters, opera, art galleries, concert halls, art schools, etc. operate under the Federal Ministry of Education. The Federal Theaters, for example, which are government-owned enterprises, are administered by a special department of the ministry (the Bundestheaterverwaltung). (Located in Vienna, the State Opera and the Burgtheater, both Federal Theaters, have two houses apiece for their performances.) Of a total education budget of 1,405,800,000 schillings (about \$54,000,000) in 1954, the federal government expended the sum of 153,600,000 schillings (about \$6,000,000) for the Federal Theaters and 50,700,000 schillings (about \$2,000,000) for other artistic activities.

Revenue for the various arts subsidies are derived from two special taxes: (A) The Kunstförderungsbeiträge (art furtherance contribution) is a tax which owners of radio sets must pay annually for the purpose of art furtherance (Kunstförderungsbeitragsgesetz - Federal Law of June 21, 1950). In 1953 there were 1,624,053 radio subscribers in Austria. At the present time this tax amounts to 7 schillings (about 25¢) per year. (B) The Kultur Groschen (culture cent) is a tax levied upon all admissions to motion picture theaters, revenue from which is used as a Culture Contribution (Kultur Groschengesetz). This tax does not, however, apply to public educational movie centers. The maximum rate of the tax per ticket sold is 10%. One quarter of the Kultur Groschen revenues are allocated to the Federal Ministry of Education with the remaining 75% going to the state governments as state funds. According to the Kultur Groschen Law, "the entire Kultur Groschen revenue must be used without restriction for subsidizing enterprises, arrangements, or projects in the cultural field in case they are worthy of furtherance in the interests of the Federal Government, the State Government and in need of such furtherance. Government-owned enterprises may not be allowed to draw subsidies out of these funds." (In 1952 there were 1,069 motion picture theaters in Austria and attendance during that year was 104,739,000).

¹⁶ The information above as well as the tables in the appendix concerning Austria are taken from a survey specially prepared by the Austrian Government at Vienna for the purpose of aiding this and similar reports. The survey was transmitted to the author by way of the Austrian Information Service in New York.

The Ministry of Education distributes the Kultur Groschen and Kunstförderungsbeitrag revenues upon counsel from a committee composed of representatives of the states, cities and other communities, the Federal Chamber of Trade, the Chamber of Workers, and the Ministry of Finance.

Following is a list of the types of organizations, enterprises, and activities receiving subvention in Austria from the revenue derived from the special taxes described above:

1. Festivals (subsidies in the form of allowances or as deficit liability).
2. Orchestras, concert and vocal associations, music societies, artists' unions, art clubs, literary or scientific societies; music and art schools may receive regular yearly subsidies for their work or special subsidies for the carrying out of single activities or projects such as concerts, exhibitions, etc.
3. Private theaters and theater groups (with culturally worthy programs) may receive general or special subsidies, e. g.: guest tours.
4. Artists and art students may receive allowances for study tours and subsidies or work scholarships for the carrying out of special projects. Furthermore, travel allowances are granted for participants in competitions, conventions, and congresses.
5. Works of free lance artists may be bought in order to encourage the artists, or work scholarships may be granted. Free lance artists who are in need may receive allowances from public funds (Künstlerhilfe).
6. The Federal Government as well as the State Governments may grant art-encouragement and art-appreciation prizes, and public schools (i. e., art academies, etc.) may grant such prizes to their pupils at competitions.
7. The Governments (Federal and State) may pay partial printing costs for valuable publications which are of a scientific, literary, artistic, or musical nature as well as for periodicals. Cash subsidies or works of art may be given to

public libraries, schools, or public education centers.

8. They may also assume the responsibility for paying part of the costs to repair valuable instruments (organs, etc.), to restore historically important edifices, and to procure and repair expensive artistic tools.

The state and city governments grant financial aid to theaters, museums, music conservatories, art exhibition halls, etc. There are in each state museums and several public education centers. The States of Styria, Carinthia, Upper Austria, and Vienna have music conservatories. (In 1953 the federal government took over the Salzburg Music School Mozarteum from the State of Salzburg.) Federal subsidies to the state and municipal theaters amounted to 1,800,000 schillings (about \$69,300) in 1952. The nine Austrian Federal States expended 16,000,000 schillings (about \$620,000) to subsidize their theaters in 1952. There are three privately owned and operated theaters which received in that year from the federal government a subsidy of 900,000 schillings and from the City of Vienna 2,100,000 schillings. The Vienna Symphony Orchestra received a federal subsidy of 600,000 schillings and a state subsidy of 1,200,000. The Lower Austrian Music Orchestra (Tonkünstlerorchester) received similar subsidies from the Lower Austrian State Government and the Federal Austrian Government.

Painters, sculptors, architects, and designers gain employment from provisions made by the federal and state governments to allow a certain small percentage (from one to five) of all sums expended for construction of public buildings to be used to pay for decorations and embellishments. The Congress of the State of Styria has voted to allow up to 5% of the individual building cost to be used for this purpose; the State of Vorarlberg has set no maximum sum; Tyrol allows 2%; Salzburg has used more than 1.1% of its entire construction budget for 1952 and 1953 toward this end.

Private cultural institutions generally receive no tax reductions. The subsidized enterprises, on the other hand, do receive such concessions from most of the state governments. There is what is known as the Festivity Tax (Lustbarkeitssteuer) which the states reduce for their subsidized theaters and occasionally for other cultural organizations as well. In Austria there are very few private foundations that grant financial assistance to cultural or scientific institutions. One reason for their failure to compete

with the various governments in the country in the field of subsidization is the fact that they are not tax-exempt unlike corresponding foundations in the United States, for instance.

Although Austria has maintained for many decades an extensive system of subsidizing the arts, immediate postwar economic conditions forced a curtailment of grants. However, since the economy is growing stronger there are plans to increase the amounts of the subsidies. In April 1954 the Austrian National Council voted to increase the Federal Budget for Culture by 150,000,000 schillings (about \$5,775,000).

FINLAND AND SWEDEN

A rather unusual method of raising money to finance the arts exists in Sweden and Finland. It is the lottery conducted by the governments of those two countries. In Sweden a special lottery was held in 1954 for the benefit of the Royal Dramatic Theatre, which will celebrate its fiftieth anniversary in 1958. "The tickets are priced at 100 kronor, and there are five prizes of 200,000 kronor each, or about \$40,000, and sixty prizes valued at 50,000 kronor each. In all, 150,000 tickets will be sold, and approximately every ninth carries a prize. Of the 15 million kronor proceeds, 10 million will go to holders of winning tickets, while 4.4 million will be used for rebuilding the theater, principally the stage, the workshop, and the dressing rooms."¹⁷

The Lottery Fund distributed in 1952 about 12 million kronor among the following: theaters (9,700,000 kronor with the largest grants going to the Royal Opera, the Royal Dramatic Theatre, and the traveling national theater), music and orchestras (1,200,000 kronor), historical societies, the Swedish Chess Society, religious choral clubs, the Norden Society for the guest appearance of an Icelandic theatrical troupe, folk high schools, the Swedish United Nations Society, etc. "Private lotteries may be arranged if they are organized for charitable, cultural or other beneficial purposes, or for the support of Swedish artists and designers."¹⁸

In Finland¹⁹ the following theater institutions receive sub-

¹⁷ News from Sweden, Release No. 589, p. 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2

¹⁹ Information on Finland obtained from the Finnish National Travel Office, New York.

sidies from the government: 27 Finnish-speaking theaters, the Finnish Opera, 4 Swedish-speaking theaters, the University Theater, and several municipal theaters (which receive aid from both the national and municipal governments).

There are two sources for the revenue which is used for these purposes: the budget, providing one-half the amount, and government-controlled lotteries. Next year (1955) the subsidized theaters will receive additional funds from a share of the government-controlled sport pools.

NORWAY

One example of Norwegian aid to the arts is the Cathedral of Trondheim. Having been built in Medieval Scandinavia, it suffered many damages from fires and other calamities through the centuries. In 1854 the parliament of Norway decided to finance the restoration of the cathedral. Up to 1942 the total sum of 12,800,000 kroner (about \$1,798,400) was spent in restoring the cathedral, of which the state contributed 9,800,000 kroner, the remainder coming from the municipality of Trondheim, a banking house in Trondheim, and public subscription. At the present time the restoration receives about half a million kroner yearly, providing employment for many sculptors.²⁰

Two art institutions receiving state financial assistance are the National Art Gallery and the Academy of Art in Oslo. Prominent writers and artists receive state pensions of 5,000 kroner yearly (about \$700) for life. There is a law which grants to artists' organizations three per cent of all sums used to buy works of art through dealers, on exhibitions, etc., amounting to about 100,000 kroner yearly.²¹

In 1948 the Storting (parliament) created the Riksteatret, a large mobile theater which tours Norway (whose area is twice that of England) with drama and ballet even to the remotest regions where there are no local theaters and whose inhabitants seldom visit the large cities to attend the private and state-supported theaters. The state subsidy given to this organization was

20 Clayhills, *Norwegian Sculpture and its Place in Society*, p. 2.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 3.

445,000 kroner in 1952-53.²² The Riksteater Act also provides for additional financial aid from the countries and towns by means of municipal theater councils. The Riksteater gives performances before the most varied audiences in schools, factories, unions, military camps, etc.²³ In 1953 rural municipalities provided free bus service to Riksteatret shows. Also, a single rate including railway transportation and theater admission was offered to farmers from the mountain valleys.²⁴

Financial aid from the government to the Norwegian theater has produced the kind of stability among actors that is completely unknown to American actors. To begin with, continuity in employment is achieved by the existence of two factors. One is the permanence of the management organizations (the theaters). All Norwegian theaters either own or rent their houses on a long range basis. In addition, they have their own personnel. Thus, the Norwegian theater does not suffer from the dichotomy between theater ownership and production which is one of the outstanding flaws in the theater economy of the United States. Rarely does a Broadway producer nowadays own the theater which houses his productions, and just as rarely does a theater owner (real estate operator, that is) engage in production.

The other factor contributing to an actor's security in Norway is the "normal-contract" system. In Norway there is a single actors' union whereas in the United States there are separate actors' unions for each industry (Actors Equity Association for the stage, Screen Actors Guild, and the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists). The normal contract thus covers all employment in radio, touring, movies, personal appearances, etc. Furthermore, by means of it an actor is guaranteed twelve months of work with six weeks of paid vacation. If for any reason he is unemployed during the contract period, he receives his pay nevertheless. (In Norway, at least, actors have gained a guaranteed annual wage; a development that must strike an American actor as being decidedly remote in his theater.)

Another contrast with the American theater is the fact that in Norway dramatic training is essential to anyone seeking to enter the acting profession. If his training is acceptable the actor re-

²² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²³ Riksteatret, The Norwegian Office for Cultural Relations, pp. 1, 8.

²⁴ State Travelling Theater (Riksteatret), Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Section, p. 1.

ceives an audition. Upon passing it he is given a normal-contract at a minimum salary. After he has had five of these normal contracts (each running for a year) and has signed a sixth, he is admitted as a full member of the Norsk Skuespiller Forbund (Norwegian Actors Union), which was established in 1899. The union stipulates this method of reaching membership in order to discourage dilettantes and others who seek only to take a "fling" at the stage inasmuch as the union has a pension system for the genuine professionals. During his apprenticeship the young actor is protected by the Young Actors Association, formed in 1935, which holds a forum, holds monthly meetings, gives lectures, and provides a library.

Regarding the benefits of the normal-contract system, Per M. Skavlan states:

"There is no doubt that it has given the Norwegian actor social standing and security, rarely found in other countries. It also tends to keep the group together as a unit; many actors remain with the same company for ten years or a lifetime. It is interesting to note that outside the National Theater in Oslo one can see, as far as I know, the only outdoor monument in the world of an actor. It is of Johannes Brun . . . Johanne Dybwad, considered our greatest actress . . . was decorated with the highest order of the country, the Large Cross of St. Olav. Agnes Mowinkel, now seventy-six, can be ranked with our foremost directors. Recently, on her fiftieth anniversary as an actress, the youth among her audiences paid homage to her with a large torch-light procession."²⁵

Skavlan makes the following rather illuminating statement apropos the relationship between governmental subsidy and censorship:

"During my visit to the United States in 1949 I received the impression that theatre people feared that government subsidizing of theatres would mean interference with the repertoire and some sort of censorship. Only once, except during the Nazi occupation of Norway, has the Government tried to do such a thing. This occurred before the War when, on the instigation of the Church, The National Theatre was asked to cancel its production of The Green Pastures. This request met with heavy criticism and has never

²⁵ Skavlan, Per M., "The Organization of the Norwegian Theatre," from The Theatre Annual - 1951, p. 4.

been attempted again. After the War this play was produced by The Norwegian Theatre and it met with no interference. All official theatre affairs are handled by the Department of Church and Education, which has a council of professionals connected with the theatre (Statens Teaterrad), and everything runs smoothly."²⁶

²⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

III. PROGRAMS OF LESSER AID

For any number of reasons many countries have failed to keep pace with Europe in their attention to the needs of their artists. There may be in some cases the lack of sufficient social challenge to develop the arts to their maximum extent. In other cases war, depression, unassimilated and competing cultures, and geographical limitations may partially or wholly explain the apparent indifference to artists.

TURKEY

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey in 1953 allocated \$3,571,000 to complete the construction of the new Theatre and Opera building in Istanbul, which is under the State Theatres Administration. The government also opened a School of Music in Izmir; opened museums at Istanbul and Izmir; and added a gallery to the Department of Precious Jewels at Topkapu Museum.²⁷

INDIA

The Government of India recently established academies of literature, music, dance, drama, and painting for the purpose of promoting art and culture in the country. Every year these subsidized agencies, which operate under the Ministry of Education at New Delhi, grant special awards to encourage outstanding artists. In addition, universities giving courses in the arts receive subsidies from the government.²⁸

BRAZIL

The national and local governments of Brazil have been subsidizing the arts for many years.²⁹ One example of governmental subsidy is the Museum of Modern Art in Rio de Janeiro, which was recently placed in a special department of the Ministry of

²⁷ 1953 Progress Report from Turkey, p. 6.

²⁸ Information on India obtained from the Consulate General of India Information Service, New York.

²⁹ Brazilian American Survey, p. 72.

Health and Education. In 1953 the House of Representatives appropriated ten million cruzeiros (about \$500,000) and the Senate appropriated one million cruzeiros to house the museum in a special building. Besides these sums the Municipal Council of Rio contributed an additional half a million cruzeiros as well as approving the donation of a site for the building located on Guanabara Bay.

NEW ZEALAND

Every year the New Zealand Minister of Internal Affairs on the advice of professional selection committee awards bursaries (scholarships) in music, drama, ballet, and fine arts for periods varying from one to two years. In the year ending March 31, 1953 grants totaling 6,174 pounds (about \$17,410) were made to various cultural societies and institutions such as a visiting theatrical company, the Commonwealth Players, which received a subsidy of 2,146 pounds. Through the State Literary Fund the government expended the sum of 1,658 pounds to aid literature. On the recommendation of an advisory committee ten grants were made in the period mentioned above to publishing firms and one grant to a writer. The National Symphony Orchestra of New Zealand received 78,000 pounds during this same period.³⁰

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

In the Union of South Africa the state-aided museums, art galleries, archives, observatories, and the Academy for Arts and Science receive subsidies from the Department of Education, Arts and Science. Besides the national government the four provincial departments of education promote the arts in their schools, training colleges, and art centers. The estimate for subsidies to art museums, art exhibitions, and art associations is 30,000 pounds per year (\$84,000). The Department of Education of the national government pays most of the salaries and upkeep of the South African Art Gallery, Cape Town; the Michaelis Collection, Cape

³⁰ Information on New Zealand obtained from the New Zealand Embassy, Washington, D. C.

Town; and the Engelenburg Collection, Pretoria.³¹

ISRAEL

The State of Israel, which has been an independent republic for only a few years, has not as yet developed an extensive system of subsidization for the arts. Organizations like Habimah, the Chamber Theatre, the Israel National Opera Company, and Do Re Mi (an operetta company) are privately owned and operated. The national government has founded, however, an endowment to award pensions to outstanding Hebrew writers and actors. The state-owned Kol Israel, the Israel Broadcasting Service, gives employment to musicians and composers.

"Most of the companies (theaters) are owned and managed by the actors operating as a cooperative, and up to recent times all decisions on repertoire, casting, etc. were taken collectively. Now, however, most are managed by directorates elected annually by the entire company and granted freedom of action immediately thereafter."³²

In addition, the Ministry of Education and Culture is encouraging and coordinating "the activity of those engaged in Jewish study and literary research, such as the photography of Hebrew manuscripts, completion of the great lexicon of Ben Yehuda, a Talmudic concordance and encyclopaedia, the assembly of Biblical material from Talmudic literature, the writing of the annals of Jewish history, and so forth."³³

³¹ Information on the Union of South Africa was taken from a speech by the Minister of Education, Arts, and Science in the Union of South Africa Senate on April 2, 1954, obtained from the South African Government Information Office, New York.

³² *Cultural Life - Israel* 1954, pp. 5-6.

³³ Quoted from a communication from the Israel Office of Information, New York, September 9, 1954.

IV. THE SUBSIDY PICTURE AT HOME (CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES)

The United States and Canada have not developed extensive programs to aid the arts as have most countries of the world even though the United States Government financed the arts for a few years before the war to an extent greater than that of the countries of Europe, which have a strong tradition of encouraging the arts.) Nevertheless, in both these neighboring North American countries, government bodies and many private institutions have for several years investigated the plans put forth by individuals and organizations to inaugurate subsidization of the arts. One effort in this direction is the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences of Canada, created in 1949. Its purpose was to survey the existing cultural institutions in Canada and to make recommendations for expanding and improving them. One of the objectives in strengthening Canadian cultural institutions was to reduce the country's great dependence upon movies and publications from the United States.

In his Unofficial Summary of the Royal Commission's Report (1949-1951), Wilfrid Eggleston, Director of the Department of Journalism, Carleton College, Ottawa, states: "The flood of U.S. periodicals creates serious publishing problems here. Canadian magazines with much difficulty have achieved a circulation of nearly 42 millions, compared with a United States circulation in Canada of over 86 millions. 'Canada is the only country of any size in the world whose people read more foreign periodicals than those published in their own land -- local newspapers excluded.' This assertion is quoted in the Report from the submission of a member of the Periodical Press Association.

"The Canadian periodical cannot in turn invade the United States market. It faces a limited and unprotected market of nine million English-speaking readers versus 160 million readers served by its competitors."³⁴

Among the recommendations of the Royal Commission is the creation of a Canada Council for the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences. One purpose would be to aid the cultural activities of the country "by such means as the underwriting of

³⁴ Eggleston, Wilfrid, Report of the Royal Commission (Unofficial Summary), p. 8.

tours, the commissioning of music for events of national importance, and the establishment of awards to young people of promise whose talents have been revealed in national festivals of music, drama or the ballet."³⁵ Another purpose would be to arrange tours abroad by Canadian lecturers, musicians, dancers, actors, painters, and other artists to promote an interest in Canada among foreigners.

The only period in the history of the United States when the government-participated directly and extensively in the fields of the theater, radio, opera, painting, etc. was the depression. The WPA (Works Progress Administration) Arts Projects came into being in August 1935 as part of the general relief program of the government. During the first six months of the projects the government appropriated \$27,000,000 and employed about 40,000 people distributed as follows: Art Project, 5,330; Music, 15,629; Theater, 12,477; Writers, 6,500.³⁶ Until the establishment of the Arts Projects professional artistic activities had existed for the most part in only a few of the largest cities. Under government sponsorship, however, music, ballet, opera, drama, painting, and the other arts became available to millions of people across the country.

The Arts Projects were destined to operate for only a few years for with the gradual strengthening of the economy and the coming of war, Congress decided that the government's participation in the arts was unnecessary and that its expenditure of large sums of money was extravagant. Nevertheless, Congress has continued to consider proposed arts legislation introduced in nearly every session since the ending of the Arts Projects. Such bills have been designed to establish in one way or another a permanent division of the fine arts in the Federal Government. Thus far, although as many as sixteen bills came before the 83rd Congress, it failed to enact arts legislation.

Representative Charles R. Howell, Democrat from New Jersey (formerly a candidate for the Senate from that State), introduced the latest aid-to-the-arts bill, bringing the total to seventeen of such bills presented to the 83rd Congress. The objectives

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 56-57.

³⁶ Overmyer, Grace, Government and the Arts, p. 110.

of H. R. 9881, Howell's bill, (July 13, 1954) are "to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, to provide for the establishment of an American National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes."³⁷ Recognizing that "(1) great contributions can be and are being made by the fine arts to the morale, health, and general welfare of the Nation, and (2) that the city of Washington, since its establishment as the Nation's Capital in 1800, has never had a suitable theater and music center commensurate with its position of leadership among the free nations of the world," the bill proposes that Congress aid projects and programs in the fine arts developed by the states. It also proposes that Congress establish a theater and music center in Washington, D. C. to be known as the "John Basilone National Memorial Stadium" in honor of Sgt. John Basilone, a hero of the Second World War who was killed on Iwo Jima and who received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

H. R. 9881 would appropriate for the purposes it sets forth, beginning in 1955, sums not in excess of \$5,000,000.³⁸ Such funds would be available only to public or other nonprofit fine arts projects. Whenever a state developed an arts plan it could request Federal aid up to \$100,000 per year.³⁹ The subsidy system described in this bill would be known as The American National War Memorial Arts Commission and would be composed of the President as the ex officio chairman, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In addition, several other government representatives would serve on the commission; also serving would be the chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts and twenty-four eminent citizens appointed by the President upon consultation with the Senate representing the fields of the fine arts, education, recreation, and public affairs.

The other bills presented to the latest Congress, while varying in details especially in regard to appropriations, all aimed at the establishment by the Federal Government of a permanent agency which would aid the arts directly by Federal grants or by assisting the states in their efforts to aid the arts. Following the public hearings on thirteen of the arts bills held on June 8 and 9, 1954 in Washington, the Special Subcommittee on Arts Foundations and Commissions of the House Committee on Education and Labor made its report. Representatives Albert H. Bosch of New York

³⁷ H. R. 9881, p. 1.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 6 (Section 102).

³⁹ Ibid., p. 10 (Section 105a).

and Clifton Young of Nevada presented the majority position in opposition to arts legislation whereas Representative Charles R. Howell of New Jersey, who had drawn up several of the bills, expressed the minority views. The following quotation gives some of the opinions held by the majority:

"All witnesses at the hearing endorsed in some degree the concept of Federal aid for the encouragement and promotion of the fine arts. Among these witnesses were spokesmen for labor unions, libraries, learned societies, city planning groups, the theater, the symphony, the opera, and recreation associations... The hearings developed little information on the probable cost of Federal aid to the arts... Opinions varied whether it should be a program of continuing assistance, or whether the Federal contribution should be limited to getting the program under way, with private capital sustaining it from that point on. Suggestions ranged from \$50,000 annually for 20 years to a figure exceeding \$20 million a year with no fixed time limit....

"... we cannot conceive it our duty to dip even further into his (the American worker's) threadbare pocket to indulge in the luxury of subsidizing an endless variety of programs and projects supposedly related to the so-called finer arts. Neither do we believe that Federal money should be spent to subsidize the arts in order that aspiring young people will have the opportunity to succeed in their chosen field. We think, instead, that young American artistic talent will overcome the hardships it encounters, just as outstanding engineering, medical, and related talent surmounts the obstacles in its way to success. Aside from the highly questionable economics of the matter, we feel that such a subsidy would make mediocrity the standard where excellence ought to prevail. We are convinced that the programs under the WPA clearly support this conclusion....

"Until such time as this program can be sustained as an absolute necessity, its evident cost cannot be justified.... The legislation proposed is so loosely drawn and so indefinite in financial and administrative procedures that it is most unlikely to achieve its goal... we recommend that none of the bills referred to in this report be passed."⁴⁰

40 Federal Grants for Fine Arts Programs and Projects (Special Subcommittee Report), pp. 1-3.

Representative Howell, presenting the minority position, re-emphasized the fact that the government spends many millions of dollars annually to support several industries and special groups of citizens. For example, during the fiscal years 1949 to 1955 the following expenditures were made: \$3,773,000 for agriculture, \$5,873,000 for business, \$1,435,000 for labor, etc.⁴¹ "Appropriations for the National Science Foundation for 1955 total \$12,250,000, while the Federal Government altogether spends more than \$2 billions on its science research and development programs. The sums contemplated by these newly revised fine arts bills, when compared with the immense Federal budget full of help for so many sectors of the American economy and for our friends and allies overseas, are like a grain of wheat in a bushel basket or a grain of sand at the beach. Provisions for scholarships and fellowships are contained in the National Science Foundation Act for scientists, and education programs are financed under a number of other Federal laws."⁴²

Representative Howell and several of the other advocates of arts legislation maintain that the Soviet Union has outstripped the United States in cultural matters by spending a great portion of its wealth to develop its artists, writers, musicians, poets, actors, etc. and by using cultural means to win adherents abroad. Enactment of arts legislation, according to these advocates, should contribute enormously toward the enhancement of American prestige among the nations of the world in the struggle between democracy and communism.

Despite the fact that the national government does not subsidize the arts in the United States, several municipal governments have for a number of years encouraged the arts by supporting symphony orchestras and art museums. In the field of music are the annual grants to symphony orchestras made by the following cities with the approximate annual amounts: Baltimore, \$60,000; Buffalo, \$17,000; Denver, \$19,000; Indianapolis, \$50,000; Los Angeles (city and county), \$90,000; New Orleans, \$16,000; and Philadelphia, \$50,000.⁴³

41 Ibid., p. 13.

42 Ibid., p. 15.

43 "Municipal Subsidies to Symphony Orchestras," The American City, p. 93.

The State of Virginia is engaged in subsidizing the arts to the extent of \$10,000 annually, which is the amount of its grant to the Barter Theatre.⁴⁴ In existence for more than two decades the Barter Theatre has toured the state with productions of modern and classical plays, appearing wherever there were theatres or auditoriums to accommodate it. It was organized in 1933 by Robert Porterfield, an unemployed actor who left New York with a group of fellow actors and actresses to set up a theater in the town of his origin, Abingdon, Virginia. The name of the theater which he founded is derived from its practice in the early days of exchanging admissions for food from farmers who lived near Abingdon. "That first summer 80 per cent of the admissions to the ten plays produced were paid in hams, eggs, live poultry, fresh vegetables, home canned jellies and preserves and even livestock."⁴⁵ Since the actors from New York, who had been jobless most of the time during their careers, needed food, and since the farmers of southwest Virginia were abundantly supplied with all kinds of foodstuffs, the exchange was natural. When they realized the popularity of this theater among the people of the state, the Virginia legislators made an appropriation of \$10,000 in 1946 to aid its work.

44 Tetley, Gerard, "Dixie Invasion," New York Times, p. X3; and Phillips, Cabell, "Art for Ham's Sake," The New York Times Magazine, p. 22.

45 Ibid. (Phillips), p. 22

CONCLUSION

The reader may have noticed that there appears to be some relation between the countries having highly developed "welfare state" programs (e. g. : England, Scandinavia) and those having the most ambitious budgets for art subsidy. But pride in the preservation or the fostering of a national culture may also be a strong incentive for nations which have been more reluctant in the field of social welfare (e. g. : Ireland, France).

Whether either of these trends will have any effect in the United States remains to be seen. America will have to decide less on the question of: are there any funds available and more on the question of: is this the best use for available funds or is it worth the effort inherent in the raising of new monies. This decision, like so many others that are made by governments, is basically an ethical one based on a particular set of values.

The past years have seen the extension of government subsidy to a vast number of private as well as public enterprise. The question of aid in the form of tax exemption has been debated as well as the more direct method of grants in aid. Whether the arts constitute another area of public support will be debated in the coming years. Here again, the decision will rest with the congressmen and their concept of public interest.

Government aid to the arts can affect the life of every citizen throughout the country. The money concerned, like all power, is itself neutral. It can be used to help encourage the arts and the artists of America, to bolster an area which has been largely neglected by public grants or it can stifle artistic impulses and harm the excellent work that has already been done on the local level, by private foundations, and the other interested organizations. The decision will rest not only on a single decision by each citizen, but on his continued interest and vigilance.

APPENDIX

The following tables contain information on appropriations made by the several governments named. As indicated in the footnotes these statistics were supplied by consulates and information services located in the United States.

A U S T R I A *

(As of June 1953 one schilling
equaled . 0385 dollars.)

Direct Federal Expenditures on Culture

(in schillings)

	<u>1954</u>	<u>Percentage of the entire Federal Budget</u>
Entire expenditures for education, science, and the arts (Federal Ministry of Education)	1,405,800,000	6.3
<u>Of the above amount</u>		
Entire expenditures for Federal Theaters	153,600,000	.7
Art tasks in the strict meaning	50,700,000	.2
Colleges and scientific institutions	177,400,000	.8

Expenditures for the Federal Theaters

	<u>1954</u>
Investments for reconstruction	70,000,000
Entire maintenance expenditures	83,600,000

*These tables are taken from the special survey prepared by the
Austrian Government as noted previously.

Art Tasks in the Strict Meaning

	<u>1954</u>
Fine Arts	5,577,000
Music and dramatic arts	10,191,000
Museums and galleries	12,443,000
Maintenance of monuments	3,953,000
Literature	271,000
Photography and motion pictures	3,726,000
Culture furtherance from special taxes (explained in the Austrian entry in Section I)	14,500,000

Legal personnel and material expenditures for 8 government-owned museums and collections, 4 art and music academies, one school (Motion Picture Center), and the Federal Monument Department are subject to the expenditures mentioned above.

Subsidies during the year 1952 from special taxes

	<u>Kulturgroschen (Federal Share 25%)</u>	<u>Kunstforderungsbeiträge (RAVAG-Schilling special radio tax)</u>
Music	856,500	2,090,300
Theater	2,738,100	1,743,600
Creative Art	93,000	1,818,100
Literature	355,000	750,400
Public Education	426,800	--
Science	297,100	--
Cinematography	465,500	250,000
Monument maintenance	100,000	967,800
Art schools	--	990,800
Museums and galleries	--	245,200
Other cultural institutions	--	145,500
TOTAL	5,332,100	9,001,700

State Subsidies to Nationally and Municipally Owned Theatres

In 1952, the states of Graz, Innsbruck, Klagenfurt, Linz and Salzburg spent 23,900,000 Schillings.

Comparison of Governmental Subsidies for Art & Science

<u>Government</u>	<u>1952</u>
Federal	341,000,000
State	63,000,000
Municipal	83,000,000

State Expenditures for Art Work on Public Buildings - 1952-53

The States of Graz, Klagenfurt, Linz and Salzburg and the City of Vienna spent 5,080,400 S. on Art Work out of a total construction budget of 1,094,442,000 S., an average of roughly .6%.

F I N L A N D

Government Subsidized Theaters

(As of June 1953 one markkaa equaled .0045 dollars.)

	<u>National Government Aid</u>		<u>Local Government Aid</u>
	(in markkaa)		(in markkaa)
1948	23,000,000		
1949	34,000,000		
1950	38,000,000		
1951	47,000,000		
1952	61,300,000	1952	90,000,000
1953	65,000,000	1953	106,000,000

NOTE: These figures were obtained from the Finnish National Travel Office, New York.

G R E A T B R I T A I N

General Expenditure on the Arts*

(As of June 1953 one
pound equaled 2.8165
dollars.)

	<u>1952 - 1953</u>	<u>To the Nearest Pound</u>
Opera and ballet		427,151
Drama		72,367
Art		30,642
Poetry grants		648
Arts centres and arts clubs		4,143
Regional projects		1,105
Festivals		2,903

The Council's Committee in Scotland**General Expenditure on the Arts for the Year Ended March 3, 1953

Music	20,615
Drama	12,920
Ballet	1,637
Art	4,480
Building and equipment	550
Edinburgh Festival Society	5,000

Estimates on Government Expenditure for Encouragement
of the Arts # ##

<u>Society or Organization</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 1950 - 1951 (in pounds)</u>
Arts Council of Great Britain	675,000
British Council	3,233,700

* The Public and the Arts, the 8th annual report of the Arts
Council of Great Britain, 1952-53, pp. 64-65.

** Ibid., p. 72.

Certain science museums are included since they make a con-
tribution to the artistic life of the country.

Entertainment and the Arts in Great Britain, British Informa-
tion Services, p. 31.

Great Britain (continued)Society or Organization

Fiscal Year
1950 - 1951

British Broadcasting Corporation	17,285,000
Council of Industrial Design	268,000
British Film Institute	41,500
Festival of Britain 1951	5,262,625
British Museum	302,064
Victoria and Albert Museum	226,340
Natural History Museum	212,886
Science Museum	139,822
Imperial War Museum	29,888
London Museum	12,880
National Maritime Museum	23,698
Royal Scottish Museum	49,897
National Museum, Wales	45,750
Soane Museum	2,250
National Gallery (including Tate)	78,695
National Portrait Gallery	17,995
Wallace Collection	25,621
National Galleries, Scotland	28,898
Royal Academy of Music	17,000
Royal College of Music	16,500
Royal Manchester College of Music	5,000
Royal Scottish Academy of Music	5,200
Royal Academy of Dramatic Art	3,000
Art Schools	180,500
British Academy	33,500
National Central Library	25,000
National Library, Scotland	13,593
Scottish Central Library	3,440
National Library, Wales	42,000
Art and Science Buildings (maintenance)	1,310,000
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens	719,100
Historic Monuments	65,000
Ancient Monuments	225,000
National Building Records	11,000

* * *

Great Britain (continued)Yearly Grants-in-Aid to the Arts Council*

Grants-in-Aid on Treasury Vote	1946-47	350,000
	1947-48	428,000
	1948-49	575,000
	1949-50	600,000
	1950-51	675,000

Expenditure of the Arts Council in 1948-49**

	(amounts in pounds)	
Opera and Ballet		196,912
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden	145,000	
Sadler's Wells Theatre	40,000	
Music		124,848
Grants to Symphony orchestras	42,529	
Grants to Chamber and String orchestras and quartets	8,675	
National Federation of Music Societies	13,050	
Directly provided concerts	33,509	
Drama		100,425
Old Vic Trust	26,000	
Art		40,127
Grant to the Scottish Committee		42,000
General		18,529
Edinburgh Festival	10,000	
Administration		60,250

I R E L A N D

Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1954.

(As of June, 1953 the pound in Ireland equaled 2.8150 dollars.)

176,530 Pounds were spent in the following categories:

Institutions of Science and Art, National Museum, National Library, Geneological Office, National College of Art, Publications, Periodicals and Dramatic Productions in Irish, The Irish Folklore Com-

* Entertainment and the Arts in Great Britain, p. 32

** Ibid., p. 33.

Ireland (continued)

mission, The National Irish Film Institute and miscellaneous grants for courses, scholarships, exhibit, etc.

This sum represents a net increase of 13,340 pounds over the previous fiscal year.

(This data is to be found on pp. 218, ff. in Estimates for Public Service published by the Government of Ireland Stationery Office.

I T A L Y

(As of June 1953 one lire equaled .0016 dollars)

Government Subsidies to Theater and Music*
(in lire)

1948-49	785,908,625
1949-50	773,770,956
1950-51	994,223,010
1951-52	920,000,000
1952-53	920,000,000

N E T H E R L A N D S**

(As of June 1953 one guilder equaled .1405 dollars)

	1954 (amounts in guilders)
The Arts -- Total Amount	6,000,000
General Management	1,127,965
Music and Dancing	3,229,685
Music	2,554,685
Opera	600,000
Dancing	75,000
Stage and Literature	786,000
Dramatic Arts	660,000
Literature	126,000
Fine Arts and Architecture	553,350
National Academy of Fine Arts at Amsterdam	265,350

* Documenti Di Vita Italiana, January-February 1953 (No. 14-15), p. 1150.

** These figures were supplied by the Netherlands Information Service, New York.

Netherlands (continued)

	<u>1954</u>
Other expenses concerning Fine Arts	288,000
Film	303,000

N E W Z E A L A N D

(As of April 1954 the New Zealand pound was equal to approximately \$2.82.)

1953 (year ending March 31)*

Music (12 bursaries)	5,940 (in pounds)
Drama (7 bursaries)	3,960
Ballet (2 bursaries)	540
Fine Arts (one traveling scholarship)	<u>1,000</u>
	11,440

N O R W A Y**Governmental Subsidies to the Arts

(As of June 1953 one krone equaled .1405 in dollars)

	<u>1953/54</u> (amounts in kroner)
Various scholarships and all salaries to outstanding exponents in the arts as selected by Parliament	496,930
Various exhibitions and galleries (including the National Gallery)	576,250
Music	498,000
Theater	2,000,000

* Figures obtained from the New Zealand Embassy, Washington 8, D.C.

** These figures are taken from information supplied by the Norwegian Information Service of the Embassy of Norway, New York office.

Norway (continued)

	<u>1953/54</u>
Special appropriation for art, music, and theater	106,000
State Academy for painters and sculptors	167,100
Arts and crafts museums	239,500
Amateur art	60,000
National Society of Arts and Crafts	<u>45,000</u>
TOTAL	4,128,780

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brazilian American Survey - 1953-54, New York, 1953.

Clayhills, H., Norwegian Sculpture and its Place in Society, Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Service, Oslo, November 1951.

Documenti Di Vita Italiana, January-February 1953 (No. 14-15).

Eggleston, Wilfrid, Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (unofficial summary) - Canada 1949-51.

Entertainment and the Arts in Great Britain, British Information Services, November 1950.

Estimates for Public Service (for the year ending March 31, 1954), Government of Ireland Stationery Office.

Federal Grants for Fine Arts Programs and Projects (Hearings before a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives), Hearings held at Washington, D. C., June 8 and 9, 1954, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1954.

Federal Grants for Fine Arts Programs and Projects (Report of the Special Subcommittee mentioned above), September 21, 1954.

H. R. 9881 (bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Charles R. Howell), July 13, 1954.

Israel 1954 Cultural Life, Israel Office of Information, New York.

Jenkins, Newell, "Opera in Italy," Musical America, vol. 72, #3, February 1952.

"Municipal Subsidies to Symphony Orchestras," The American City, April 1952, p. 93.

News from Sweden, The American-Swedish News Exchange, Inc., New York, Release No. 589, January 27, 1954.

1953 Progress Report from Turkey, Turkish Information Office, New York.

Overmyer, Grace, Government and the Arts, W. W. Norton, New York, 1939.

Phillips, Cabell, "Art for Ham's Sake," The New York Times Magazine, June 23, 1946.

The Public and the Arts (8th annual report), Arts Council of Great Britain, 1952-53.

Riksteatret, The Norwegian Office for Cultural Relations, Oslo.

Skavlan, Per M., "The Organization of the Norwegian Theatre," The Theatre Annual - 1951, Norwegian Information Service, New York, 1951.

State Travelling Theater (Riksteatret), Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Section, Oslo, January 1954.

Tetley, Gerard, "Dixie Invasion," The New York Times, April 6, 1947, p. X3, col. 7.

SUGGESTED READING

The following, all but a few of which are magazine articles, present various attitudes on subsidization of the arts by government, describe existing government-aided institutions abroad, or propose plans for governmental intervention in the arts or oppose such intervention with suggestions of substitutes. For the most part these works have been published during the past five or ten years. They are all obtainable at the New York Public Library.

* * *

"A Civic Theatre Charter -- local government act through Commons," Theatre Newsletter, March 6, 1948, pp. 6-7, London.

Arnadottir, Thorbjorg, "The National Theatre of Iceland," Players Magazine, January 1951.

"Art in a planning economy," Theatre Managers Journal, May 1944.

"Art, profit, efficiency: Britain examines practice and theory; work of Arts Council," Christian Science Monitor Magazine, April 1, 1950.

Bridie, James, "A National Theatre," Royal Philosophical Society of Glasgow Proceedings, Glasgow, 1940, vol. 64, pp. 23-39.

Bergh, Balthazar, "National Theatres in Norway," Theatre Arts Monthly, 1938, vol. 22, pp. 264-272.

Brant, L. V. and Cleva, F. (eds.), "Should we have a ministry of fine arts?" Etude, May 1953.

(Reply to above: Price, W. W., Etude, July 1953).

Burr, Eugene, "A National Theater for the Theater," Theater Time, 1950.

Carroll, C. M., "Panacea? Howell Bill," Musical America, February 1, 1954.

"Congressman proposes establishment of a federal commission for fine arts," Musical America, February 1953.

"Congressmen issue joint statement on pending arts subsidy legislation," Musical America, February 1, 1954.

Davie, Mary, "State aid and the arts," Music, 1950, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

"Dondero on the Left," Newsweek, June 20, 1949.

Evans, Benjamin Ifor and Glasgow, Mary, The Arts in England, 1949.

Fellowes, M. and Melchior, Lauritz, "American way of life in art?" Etude, October 1953.

Flanagan, Hallie, Arena (giving a comprehensive picture of the Federal Theater Project under the prewar WPA).

Foote, A., Profitable Hobbies, "Art and government," February, 1954.

Frankenstein, A., "Municipal subsidy: benefits and problems in San Francisco," Musical America, February 1952.

Geiringer, Karl, "A relief scheme for music in America," Musical Times, January 1940.

Gordon, Alan, "Should the state control its artists?" Keynote, Autumn 1946.

"Government in art?" Time, August 10, 1953.

Grafly, D., "Art mountain conceives a mouse," American Artist, December 1953.

Hobson, Geoffrey Dudley, Some Thoughts on the Organization of Art after the War.

Jacobs, A., "British orchestras and government," Musical America, November 1, 1950.

James, P., "Government and art in Great Britain," Magazine of Art, January 1951.

Josephson, M., "Vandals are here," Nation, September 26, 1953.
Reply: Watson, E. W., American Artist, November 1953.

Landstone, Charles, Notes on Civic Theatres, Arts Council of Great Britain, 1950.

Lynes, R., "Government as a patron of the arts," Yale Review, September 1952.

"Money for music: political overtones," Musical America, November 1, 1952.

"Music leaders give views on federal aid: Howell Bill," Musical America, November 15, 1953.

Myers, Rollo, H., Music in the Modern World.

"No Marshall plan for American opera!" Musical America, October 1953.

"Our musical life in a supreme crisis," Musical America, April 1, 1951.

Petrillo, James C., "Petrillo stresses need for government subsidy," Musical America, February 15, 1954.

Priestley, John Boynton, The Arts under Socialism -- Lecture to Fabian Society.

Read, Herbert, "The state as patron," University Observer, 1947, vol. I, No. 1.

Reeves, R., "What price our people's culture?" Design, March 1954.

Sherek, H., "Why not subsidy for theater?" New York Times Magazine, April 16, 1950.

THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

OBJECT: Education for Increasing Democracy in our Economic, Political and Cultural Life.

In its fifty years of existence, the L. I. D. has performed a unique function as a center of research and education for all Americans of progressive mind who have sought to make democracy more than a slogan but something that, as John Dewey, the LID's late president said, is a living reality in every aspect of our everyday life.

Alone among America's many organizations, the LID has had the men and the methods needed for such a program of education. Its pamphlets, conferences, broadcasts, lectures and chapters have done much to stimulate informed interest in the problems of democracy. Its approach has always been one of experimentation and pragmatism; tied to no dogma or doctrine the LID has sought new answers to the perennial problems which have faced mankind.

Increasing democracy has been sought in all fields; labor, co-operatives, democratic control and ownership, social legislation, civil rights, democratic planning, etc., etc. The list itself is never ending, it is the task of the LID to discover new methods that are consistent with its faith in democracy and individual rights and which will seek to use the vast resources at our disposal to solve our social, economic and cultural programs.

The Student L. I. D. has performed these tasks on the college level, serving as the focal point for students of liberal mind and introducing the wider college audiences to many of our contemporary issues. The list of noted leaders of today who had the start in the S. L. I. D. is long and impressive. But the task now is to find the students who will, in time, play the role of the Reuthers, the Douglasses and the Lippmans.

The L. I. D. and S. L. I. D. offer no guarantee of a panacea; but the promise of exciting, vital and above all necessary thinking and experimenting. Members receive all LID publications, participate in its activities and elect its officers. If you are interested, please use the blank provided below.

 _____ I would like to know more about the L. I. D. _____ about S. L. I. D.

_____ I herewith contribute _____ for the educational work of the S. L. I. D.
 (Contributions may be earmarked to permit free distribution of specific Tracts.) This contribution may be deducted for income tax purposes.

_____ I should like to become a member of the L. I. D. (membership dues are \$5, \$10-100 for sustaining, \$100 or above for life and \$1 for student membership).

Enclosed find _____ Name _____
 Address _____

S. L. I. D. and L. I. D. PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST

S. L. I. D. Research Tracts: A new series of objective and thoroughly documented studies of key problems in our economic, political and social life. Previously published titles include:

Steward Training in C. I. O. Unions, by Mildred Bersh, 40 pp. 25¢

Distribution of Income in the United States, by Gabriel Kolko, 20 pp. 25¢

The Worker Priests (A study of the French experiment) by Marie T. Dubalen, 60 pp. 25¢

The Quiet Revolution (A study of the Catholic Antigonish movement for technical aid to underdeveloped areas) by Harold Lewack, 24 pp. 25¢

In ordering S. L. I. D. Research Tracts please note that: regular trade discounts are offered to bookstores; libraries, schools, unions and other interested organizations may purchase bulk orders at these discounts:
5-9, 10%; 10-24, 20%; 25-50, 30%; over 50, 40%.

The publishing of this series is a non-profit venture.

Recent publications of the League for Industrial Democracy

Down on the Farm, the Plight of Agricultural Labor
(Published with the National Sharecroppers Fund) 25¢

The Age of Automation, its Effects on Human Welfare, an excellent introduction to the question, by Warner Bloomberg, Jr. 35¢

T. V. A. and its Critics by Gordon Clapp 15¢. An analysis and explanation of T. V. A. by its former chairman.

How Free is Free Enterprise? A Symposium edited by Dr. Laidler; includes statements by George Meany, Mark Starr and others. 35¢

The Taft Hartley Law in Action, by Jack Barbash (former Staff Director of the Senate Commission on Labor and Labor Management). 25¢

Democratic Socialism, A New Appraisal by Norman Thomas. A historic re-statement of principles and problems. 25¢

The Forward March of American Labor by Theresa Wolfson and Joseph Glaser. An excellent introduction to the history of American Trade Unionism. 15¢

The Right to Make Mistakes by George S. Counts. A powerful plea for free inquiry by the noted educator. 10¢

Discounts on quantity orders of LID pamphlets are available at: 100-249, 20%; 250-499, 25%; 500 and over, 30%.

Mail orders to either Student League for Industrial Democracy or League for Industrial Democracy, 112 East 19th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

To facilitate bookkeeping, please enclose payment on orders under \$1.00.